

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

Health Level 3 91462, 91465

## Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to 2015 examinations for all achievement standards covered by this report.

Candidate responses that reflected their own thinking and learning were the most effective. Prepared responses that did not enable the candidate to answer the questions that were being asked limited students from achieving higher grades.

Candidates who answered questions concisely and coherently generally achieved higher grades as the emphasis is on the quality of the response not the quality of the writing.

Candidates using resource material relevant to their identified issue is increasing. A number of candidates still need to ensure that their evidence is sourced, current, accurate and relevant.

Candidates are showing a greater understanding of the application of the determinants of health to their chosen health issue.

## Part B: Report on standards

### 1. Assessment Report for 91462: Analyse an international health issue

Successful candidates provided concise, well sourced focused answers rather than lengthy responses that demonstrated limited relevance to the question.

Candidates are encouraged to read each part of the question carefully and only provide relevant material in their response. A number of candidates repeated information in different parts of the paper instead of ensuring that they answered specifically what was being asked in that section of the paper. When the implications were asked for some candidates wrote about what influence of their determinant was. This was particularly evident for papers where it appeared that candidates had pre prepared answers based on the previous year's exam paper.

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outlined a health issue which is causing international concern</li> <li>• explained the influence of two of the major Determinants of Health and how these were contributing to the issue</li> <li>• showed an understanding of well being</li> <li>• explained an understanding of relevant recommendations that related to the Determinants of Health, though the links may be loose</li> <li>• recommended strategies which allowed for more equitable outcomes</li> <li>• used some referenced evidence throughout the paper however generally quite generic and not specific to the information being stated.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• failed to complete all parts of the paper</li> <li>• failed to discuss why the chosen issue was of international concern</li> <li>• failed to use a topic from the 2015 specifications</li> <li>• failed to link the most important Determinants of Health to their explanation of the influence on the issue</li> <li>• failed to use Determinants of Health</li> <li>• failed to provide implications that related to the societal or wider community</li> <li>• failed to provide adequate supporting evidence that was credible and referenced</li> <li>• recommendations did not address the issue</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recommendations did not reflect equitable outcomes</li> <li>• only one recommendation was made</li> <li>• showed little understanding of health key concepts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Merit</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provided in-depth credible, referenced supporting evidence from differing sources</li> <li>• provided an answer that showed a clear understanding of the international health issue that the candidate identified</li> <li>• explained in-depth the two most relevant determinants for the chosen international health issue</li> <li>• explained in-depth implications that related to the stated determinants</li> <li>• explained in-depth two strategies that linked to the influencing factors previously discussed and displayed an understanding of how these created more equitable outcomes</li> <li>• failed to show how the underlying concepts of health applied to their international health issue</li> <li>• failed to provide an answer that was concise and coherent for all parts of the paper.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Excellence</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outlined a health issue which is causing international concern and outlined the impacts on wellbeing</li> <li>• provided a wide range of supporting evidence from a wide range of credible sources</li> <li>• made use of credible and referenced evidence throughout all parts of the paper where appropriate</li> <li>• demonstrated a perceptive analysis of the two most significant Determinants of Health for the identified international health issue and comprehensively explained how these are influencing the issue</li> <li>• perceptively analysed the significant implications and how these relate to the socio-ecological perspective</li> <li>• coherently explains two recommendations that are linked to the influencing factors and implications previously outlined with details about how these can be actioned</li> <li>• the recommendations often provided supporting evidence to support their proposal, linking it to parts of the Ottawa Charter or strategies from WHO, UN or from successful previous health campaigns</li> <li>• provided a perceptive analysis of how outcomes would be more equitable if recommendations were implemented</li> <li>• concise and coherent answers with little preamble or repetition within or between questions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard specific comments</b></p>	<p>Overall the standard was completed with candidates generally showing a good understanding of their chosen topic/s. The majority of candidates utilised the provided space more effectively this year with less candidates repeating information or writing papers that were rambling. However, there were still candidates who could have received higher grades if they had not repeated information throughout the different parts of the question. These candidates did not provide answers that were concise and coherent.</p> <p>The amount of space in the exam booklet is an indication of the space that is required to answer the question effectively.</p>

## 2. Assessment Report for 91465: Evaluate models for health promotion

Successful candidates provided concise, focused answers rather than lengthy responses that demonstrated limited relevance to the question. Candidates are encouraged to read the question carefully and only provide relevant material in their response.

<p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provided information about 1 or 2 models but had little or no explanation about how they would be represented in the campaign</li> <li>• provided limited information about why the models would be included in the campaign</li> <li>• correctly explained the models, but only as they were represented in the Resource Booklet campaign</li> <li>• demonstrated some understanding of the differences between the chosen models</li> <li>• provided possible implications for those directly affected by the chosen issue (e.g. individuals who smoked)</li> <li>• correctly described principles from the Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi that could be incorporated into the campaign.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Not Achieved</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quoted extensively from the Resource Booklet, but did not interpret (re-phrase) or explain the quoted material or explain how it would be represented in the campaign</li> <li>• inaccurately explained the models, Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi</li> <li>• did not attempt all parts of the paper or provided very brief responses to one or more parts</li> <li>• explained the Ottawa Charter instead of a model for health promotion or instead of the Bangkok Charter and Treaty of Waitangi</li> <li>• provided little information on how well-being would be improved.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Merit</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provided clear in-depth explanations of the models chosen and why they chose to include them</li> <li>• demonstrated understanding of the models but how they would be represented was often simplistic, e.g. the collective action could have speakers from the community go and talk at schools</li> <li>• demonstrated some understanding of how well-being could be improved that went beyond those individuals directly affected, e.g. included families, community and/or NZ society</li> <li>• demonstrated some understanding of the Bangkok Charter and/or the Treaty of Waitangi, how they could be included in the campaign, and how well-being would then improve for New Zealanders</li> <li>• applied the resource material appropriately e.g. re-phrased it or gave a brief quote from the resource followed by an explanation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Achieved with Excellence</b></p>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provided a clear conceptual understanding of the models of health promotion, the Bangkok Charter and the Treaty of Waitangi</li> <li>• recognised that the collective action model was required for the campaign to effectively provide long term sustainable changes</li> <li>• included insightful and critical implications for people’s well-being, which was inclusive of all those affected</li> <li>• correctly related the models and why they were included to the underlying concepts</li> <li>• recognised that there are factors outside the control of individuals, such as determinants of health, that needed to be addressed in their chosen campaign.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard specific comments</b></p>	<p>Some candidates used what appeared to be memorised answers (particularly for the models of health promotion and the Bangkok Charter). They did not tailor their answers to the questions provided. This severely disadvantages them from achieving the results they may have been capable of had they considered their answers in relation to the actual question posed in the paper.</p> <p>The collective action model was not clearly understood by a significant number of candidates. Many merely quoted the resource then gave simplistic explanations of how it would be represented, e.g. professionals can do a survey; people will go and talk at school assemblies.</p>

The implications for well-being were often brief and focused on the most obvious (the well-being of the individual) rather than "the well-being of those affected", e.g. individual, family, community.

The Treaty of Waitangi was not well understood and was often misrepresented by candidates, e.g. the Crown works for all New Zealanders; the Treaty makes sure Māori get equal access to the campaign. Many candidates did not acknowledge the importance of the principles and provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi in ensuring health promotion works towards equitable health status for Māori.